



Planning Commission Staff Report

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: JORDAN FELD, AICP, SENIOR PLANNER *DF*
(480) 503-6748, JORDAN.FELD@GILBERTAZ.GOV

THROUGH: CATHERINE LORBEER AICP, PRINCIPAL PLANNER *ajl*
(480) 503-6016, CATHERINE.LORBEER@GILBERTAZ.GOV

MEETING DATE: DECEMBER 3, 2014

SUBJECT: Z14-15(C): REQUEST TO AMEND THE TOWN OF GILBERT LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, CHAPTER I ZONING REGULATIONS, DIVISION 4 GENERAL REGULATIONS, ARTICLE 4.2 OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REGULATIONS, SECTION 4.204 NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES REQUIRED, TABLE 4.204: OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS, TO INCREASE THE REQUIRED PARKING FOR COMPACT SINGLE FAMILY DEVELOPMENT.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVE: Community Livability

This text amendment seeks to ensure future compact single family residential development provides adequate guest parking capacity; safe and efficient mobility is imperative to the Strategic Initiative of Community Livability.

RECOMMENDED MOTION

FOR THE REASONS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT, AND AS DETERMINED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION, MOVE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE TOWN COUNCIL FOR Z14-15(C).

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

History

<i>Date</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>June 26, 2014</i>	Town Council directs staff to analyze higher density single family development guest parking issues.
<i>July 2, 2014</i>	Planning Commission conducted a Citizen Review meeting and initiated the Land Development Code Cleanup (Z14-15).
<i>September 23, 2014</i>	Town Council held a Study Session to discuss the initial staff analysis of guest parking issues.
<i>October 1, 2014</i>	Planning Commission held a Study Session to discuss the initial staff analysis of guest parking issues.
<i>November 5, 2014</i>	Planning Commission held a Study Session to review the preliminary staff recommendation and provide further direction.

Overview

At the Planning Commission's July 2, 2014 meeting, the Commission held a citizen review and initiated Z14-15, a comprehensive text amendment of the Land Development Code (LDC) to address a multitude of technical corrections, improvements and enhancements with the goal of realizing opportunities for more consistent, predictable and desired development outcomes. During discussion, staff noted that it would be returning with various components of the comprehensive text amendment as each portion was ready for Planning Commission review. The Planning Commission has previously reviewed and Town Council has approved the first two components of the LDC Update, Z14-15(A) and Z14-15(B). The subject text amendment, Z14-15(C) deals exclusively with visitor parking in higher density single family residential development. This issue has been specifically identified by Town Council as a priority item to address in the LDC clean-up.

Staff provided an initial analysis of visitor parking issues to the Planning Commission at its October 1, 2014 Study Session. Staff has received several complaints from residents of higher density single family (SF) residential development that adequate guest parking is not being provided. This issue is not unique to the Town, nor is the outcome (complaints regarding lack of parking) necessarily unanticipated; more compact, higher density SF development is characterized by design that is less auto-oriented than conventional larger-lot SF development.

Planning Commission Study Session (November 5, 2014)

The Planning Commission held a Study Session on this item at its regular meeting November 5, 2014. The preceding text amendment "legislative edit", as prepared by staff, was reviewed in depth at that Study Session. The Planning Commission seemed to be in general agreement that there was a need to increase the minimum requirements for guest parking in compact single family development. The Planning Commission noted that additional parking demand issues were attributable to the variety of ways residents utilize their garages; when the garage is used

for storage, the anticipated parking supply is reduced and when a required two-car garage is serving a larger house (on a compact lot), the parking demand increases without an increase in the required parking supply. On-street guest parking capacity is impacted by this through spillover demand, with the effect (noted by the Planning Commission) being the remainder of available guest parking spaces tending to be located further away from the dwelling unit. Staff finds that the spillover effect discussed by the Planning Commission can be addressed through a modification to the initial staff recommendation. Because even properly designed auto-court and alley-loaded development with internal/off-street guest parking pockets can be impacted by this spillover effect; staff recommends an increase in the guest parking requirement for larger homes (2500sf+) that do not internalize their parking demand and garage utilization by providing additional garage space. Staff is also recommending a standard for maximum allowable separation between a dwelling unit's entry and that dwelling unit's required guest parking (as reviewed through the proposed parking plan requirement); this recommendation would apply to any compact single family development.

Proposed Zoning Code Amendment (Revised)

Planning staff proposes changes to the Land Development Code to increase the parking requirements for compact single family development.

Chapter 1 Zoning Regulations, Division 4 General Regulations, Article 4.2 Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations, Section 4.204 Number of Parking Spaces Required, Table 4.204: Off-Street Parking Requirements

Table 4.204 Off-Street Parking Requirements is hereby amended to read as follows (additions in **ALL CAPS BOLD UNDERLINE**; deletions in ~~strikeout~~):

4.204 Number of Parking Spaces Required

* * *

Table 4.204: Off-Street Parking Requirements

<i>Use Classification</i>	<i>Requirement (Gross Floor Area)</i>
* * *	
Residential, Permanent	
<i>Single Family (on-street parking permitted)</i>	2 enclosed spaces per unit. Residential uses in the Heritage District may provide 2 unenclosed spaces on-site.
<i>Single Family (no on-street parking)</i>	2 enclosed spaces per unit; plus .25 guest spaces per unit; <u>PLUS 6 GUEST SPACES AT THE PRIMARY ACTIVE OPEN SPACE AND 3 GUEST SPACES AT EACH SECONDARY ACTIVE OPEN SPACE.</u> Residential uses in the Heritage District may provide 2 unenclosed spaces on-site.
<u>SINGLE FAMILY, LOT WIDTH IS LESS THAN 65'</u>	<u>2 ENCLOSED SPACES PER UNIT; PLUS 0.5 GUEST PARKING SPACES PER UNIT; PLUS 0.5 GUEST PARKING SPACES PER UNIT THAT PROVIDES LESS THAN 3 ENCLOSED SPACES AND HAS A</u>
<u>OR</u>	

<u>SINGLE FAMILY, LOT DRIVEWAY LENGTH IS LESS THAN 20'</u>	<u>LIVABLE AREA GREATER THAN 2500 SQUARE FEET; PLUS 6 GUEST SPACES AT THE PRIMARY ACTIVE OPEN SPACE AND 3 GUEST SPACES AT EACH SECONDARY ACTIVE OPEN SPACE. ALL GUEST SPACES MUST BE STRIPED AND EQUALLY DISTRIBUTED THROUGHOUT THE DEVELOPMENT; REQUIRED GUEST PARKING SHALL BE LOCATED WITHIN 200' OF THE DWELLING UNIT ENTRY. PARKING PLAN DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL REQUIRED.</u>
<i>Multi-Family</i>	1 space per 1-bedroom/studio unit; 2 spaces per 2 or more bedroom units; all plus .25 guest spaces per unit 1 space per unit shall be covered, of which 25% shall be enclosed.

* * *

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION INPUT

A notice of public hearing was published in a newspaper of general circulation in the Town, and an official notice was posted in all the required public places within the Town.

Staff will be concurrently distributing this final staff recommendation (as well as a subsequent distribution pending any modification by the Planning Commission) to the Gilbert Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Alliance, Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona, Southeast Valley Regional Association Realtors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

For the following reasons: the proposed regulations will provide for better Land Development Code clarity, enhance economic development opportunities and maintain the public's welfare, the Planning Commission moves to recommend approval to the Town Council for Z14-15(C), a request to amend Land Development Code regulations: off-street parking requirements, increase the required parking for compact single family development.

Respectfully submitted,



Jordan Feld, AICP
Senior Planner

Attachments:

Attachment 1 Draft Meeting Summary, Planning Commission Study Session 11/5/14

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
GILBERT MUNICIPAL CENTER, 50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE, GILBERT AZ
NOVEMBER 5, 2014**

COMMISSION PRESENT: Chairman Joshua Oehler
Vice Chairman Kristofer Sippel
Commissioner David Blaser
Commissioner Carl Bloomfield
Commissioner David Cavenee
Commissioner Brent Mutti
Commissioner Jennifer Wittmann

COMMISSION ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Services Manager Linda Edwards
Senior Planner Jordan Feld
Senior Planner Amy Temes
Planner Nicole McCarty

ALSO PRESENT: Town Attorney Jack Vincent
Recorder Margo Fry

CALL TO ORDER

* * *

Z14-15-C - An amendment to the Town of Gilbert Land Development to the Town of Gilbert Land Development Code to amend Land Use Regulation Tables in all Zoning Districts, amend Development Regulations and Site Regulations in all Zoning Districts, amend Sign Regulations and Subdivision Regulations.

Senior Planner Jordan Feld said that this particular batch of Land Development Code updates is specific to guest parking in higher density single family development. Staff and the Planning Commission discussed this at study session in October, 2014 and there was a general consensus among the Commission that this was an issue that they should be looking at. Mr. Feld noted that there was a dichotomy of policy occurring where they really want to push for more compact urban form, less auto oriented development and development that makes better use of pedestrian connections, transit connections and more efficient use of asphalt. All of those things can contradict the goal of having safe mobility within the subdivision. They are trying to strike that balance. Planner Feld displayed illustrations of how different developments occur and where parking occurs within those developments. In general, parking capacity is made up of on-lot, on-street and off-street parking spaces. Parking provided on the lot typically includes two enclosed spaces and may include driveway spaces or additional enclosed and unenclosed spaces to serve either resident or guest parking demand. Additional guest parking may be provided on the street, in alleys or parking lots located off a street or alley. The parking capacity of conventional residential development often results in a total supply of parking approaching 7 parking spaces per dwelling unit as each unit provides 2 enclosed spaces, 2 driveway spaces, at least 2 parking spaces on-street adjacent to the unit and approximately 1 parking space per unit elsewhere through the development, such as additional on-street parking provided by a single-loaded street or additional parking at mailbox clusters and common activity areas. This level of parking capacity provides redundancy (as certain parking spaces become limited from a temporary or recurring operational impact, the capacity is maintained) and ensures a high-level of parking capacity at or

near each dwelling unit (with two private enclosed parking spaces available to residents, two driveway spaces available to both residents and guests, and two adjacent on-street spaces available to residents and guests). Planner Feld said that he would characterize the development that he was illustrating as conventional, medium intensity development. You end up with a parking ratio approaching 7 units per acre. They require 2 for that kind of development and they would end up intrinsically with 6 to 7 spaces per unit. He displayed an example of a relatively well designed auto court which was a six-pack showing no driveways but just a drive apron connecting the garage to the alleyway with a hammerhead at the end that provides 2 additional guest parking spaces. There were 3 spaces provided on each curb, which was a nice ratio of 6 Auto Court units to 6 curb spaces. That type of development pattern results in a parking ratio of 3.3 parking spaces per dwelling unit where only 2 are required. There are a handful of developments in the town that are considered 10 packs where it is easy to look at the traffic complaint data that they collect and know that it is relegated to the development pattern that planner Feld was exhibiting. Even that development pattern yields 2.4 parking spaces per dwelling unit. That is still .4 parking spaces above the minimum requirement. Even when they exceed the minimum requirement they will still get complaints from that development which speaks to the minimum requirement issue and also to how they are designing the projects. It was noted that from 2001 – 2005 they had a lot of SF-6, SF-8, SF-D and they quickly started to hear the complaints. Administratively, staff has made some changes that have addressed some of the issues such as difficulty with trash pickups. They now require 15 feet on either side of the flare where the drive aisle comes out onto a public street. The impact of that is that they have reduced the amount of curb for parking. He noted that the Cooley Station portion that he was displaying had 3.1 spaces per dwelling unit. A rendering of Lyons gate was displayed and planner Feld noted that they get a lot of complaints about parking from that project and that even at that density the yield is still 3.6 spaces per dwelling unit. Planner Feld displayed a chart from page 7 and 8 of the staff report of what they require per development type and what traffic engineers assume is really going to happen. Planner Feld stated that he worked on a lot of projects in Maryvale that were similar and they never got complaints about them. They were on 35th Ave. or 43rd Ave. where there is a bus going up and down that Street very frequently and that incremental difference is the difference between getting complaints and not getting complaints. Someday when Gilbert's transit systems are more developed that intrinsically will eliminate a lot of the concerns that they are seeing. In the meantime there does seem to be a very real need to increase the minimum parking requirement. The most substantial change that staff is recommending is requiring a parking plan and putting it in the actual application with some of the design criteria like "how many alley loaded lots can you have before you have a guest space of some type" or "what is the maximum distance any required guest parking space for a given unit is from that unit." What they will end up with in those parking plans is that each lot will have a number and each parking space will be tied to a specific lot and they will get real counts and there will be real ties between the parking that is provided on the street and where it is relative to that dwelling unit and how many guest spaces are actually contributing to that dwelling unit. All of that occurs currently when it is multifamily but if it single family compact they don't do that today. Staff is recommending that for certain compact single family development that they would require a parking plan. Staff is suggesting that the active open space parking requirement be added on to this scenario. The matter at issue is single family lots less than 65' in width because if you have a 20 foot lot driveway at 65 feet you start to diminish the ability to provide to spaces on the curb. When there isn't a driveway they lose those 2 spaces. Staff would like a parking plan for those units that are taking away driveway parking space or curb space and the regulation is saying that they have to be provided somewhere else in the development. Mr. Feld indicated the exhibit and said that an example of how that would work in practice was that they were at 2.4 parking spaces per dwelling unit and to get them to the 2.5 requirement (not factoring in the active open space) the challenge to the home builder would be to get five more spaces. He indicated 5 spaces on the rendering and noted that gets them to the 2.5 they would require by simply making one lot a little more narrow and notching out some of the rear setback from two lots and with every other eight pack they could put a hammerhead or some other kind of guest parking or driveway internal to the auto court and you quickly add what staff feels is the desirable minimum level. Mr. Feld said that they may be wondering if .5 is enough. With a little more coordination through a DR parking plan review they could really get there. The .5 is a backstop as well as the active open space requirement. The key part of the proposed text amendment would be the parking plan requirement.

Commissioner Wittmann said that with cluster type development set on alley loaded lots there isn't a driveway but just the garage which backs into drive apron where there is not enough room for a full-size vehicle to park. She said that the homeowners are using some of that garage for storage area and when they talk about providing guest spaces it probably really isn't for guests but for homeowners to park. She said that she did not know how to resolve that issue unless they increase it substantially more to make sure that there is adequate room for two vehicles.

Planner Feld said that they definitely get the minimum length to accommodate two cars in the garage. If the developers want to give a 2 ¼ space or 2 ½ space garage staff could factor some of that additional capacity towards the requirement in theory. It would have an effect on guest parking.

Chairman Oehler said that he was in full agreement of .5 but did not know if that was enough. What are the teeth in the parking plan if the developer thinks he has enough parking already?

Planner Feld said that increasing the ratio requirement is the backstop. If the developer says no they can say it is 2.5 plus your active open space requirement and that is what it is. The parking plan would be part of the Design Review package. Not only would the operational departments be looking at the parking plan, the parking plan would go well beyond what they are seeing in terms of regulations right now. There would be guidelines and best practices put into the parking plan in an attempt to implement it through the DR process with the Design Review Board. If that process is not working staff would then attempt to amend Chapter II, the Design Guidelines in the LDC. For the most part, once the Commission approves the standards that they want for this it becomes the Design Review Board's job to try and implement what the Planning Commissions policy prerogative is. Most likely, they would not see a lot of those parking plans come back.

Chairman Oehler said that he would like them to look at .5 and see if there was a little more tweak to that.

Vice Chairman Sippel said that there had been previous discussion in terms of the size of homes. You get into a situation where there are multiple drivers in the home because of the amount of bedrooms. He said that he agreed with Commissioner Wittmann that it could be a homeowner issue as they have more vehicles than they have spaces for in their garages. He asked if that had been a topic for discussion.

Planner Feld said that it has been discussed. He said that they could look at the scenario of the dwelling livable area being more than 2500 or 3000 ft.² and perhaps there is an additional .25 that could be added on to the .5.

Vice Chairman Sippel asked if they round up.

Planner Feld said he believed that they round up to the nearest whole number and in some cases they may round down.

Commissioner Blaser said that he would be in favor of raising the number or ratio of the number of bedrooms or square footage to parking spaces.

Chairman Oehler said the only other question he had was dealing with 6 spaces per open space. He thought it was a good idea but wondered if there was a better way. He could imagine some smaller complexes on smaller acreages that would not be happy with the number 6.

Planner Feld said that staff's presumption was that when you have open space you're going to have a single loaded street and there should be on-street parking. At even the smallest pocket Park you're going to get 3 or 4 on-street spaces from that. This requirement might negatively affect 1% of the development community.

Commissioner Bloomfield referred to Planner Feld's comment that he had worked on these kinds of developments in Maryvale with no issues with the parking. Gilbert is very auto oriented. Eventually public

transit will come to the Town. Commissioner Bloomfield asked Mr. Feld if he knew when that was going to happen.

Planner Feld stated that in anticipation for this meeting he had watched the video of the last year when these cases came before the Planning Commission which told him a lot about the Commissions policy view on the subject. He also reviewed the recently updated Transportation Master Plan. Transit is coming to the Town and is based on how many people will ride it. Once you get the warrant you can begin to receive state or federal grants to put in that transit facility and work with MAG. Mr. Feld said that in the Maryvale example he should also note that he did not recall ever working on one where they didn't also get the hammerhead, the 2 common spaces at the end of the 6 pack. Gilbert will get there as well.

* * *